DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 171 EA 019 734

AUTHOR Willower, Donald J.
TITLE Waller and Schools as Organizations: An Appreciation and Criticism.
PUB DATE Oct 87
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration Career Development Seminar (University Park, PA, October 16-17, 1987).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *Case Studies; Educational Environment; *Educational Sociology; Elementary Secondary Education; Informal Organization; *Organizational Climate; Power Structure; School Community Relationship; *School Organization; Social Environment; Student School Relationship; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Waller (Willard)

ABSTRACT

Sociologist Willard Waller, writing more than 50 years ago, framed many of the key ideas found in contemporary literature on school organization. This paper is both an appreciation and criticism of Waller's seminal case studies of social interaction in schools. The paper is divided into four sections. The first two explore Waller's thought and its implications for school life in intraorganizational terms, first with regard to internal relationships among participants, then in connection with school cultures. The third examines environmental influences while the fourth considers Waller's vision of what schools ought to be, his thoughts on implementation, and the connection between his recommendations and his analysis. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED292171

WALLER AND SCHOOLS AS ORGANIZATIONS:

AN APPRECIATION AND CRITICISM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. J. Willower

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Donald J. Willower
The Pennsylvania State University

EA 019 734

Paper prepared for a Penn State-University Council for Educational Administration Conference on "The School as a Microcosm in Society: A Waller Retrospective," University Park, PA, October 1987.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

That Willard Waller, writing more than 50 years ago, framed so many of the key ideas found in the contemporary literature on schools as organizations is striking but also sobering. It is sobering because a lot of us like to think that original speculations and new discoveries are our stock in trade, yet we learn by reading Waller that much that is taken to be new, is not. Recall, for example, that Waller provided a detailed examination of school cultures, a topic that has just lately attained widespread popularity and that his conception of the school as a repository of community values is a feature of modern perspectives from the institutional organizations approach to reproduction theory.

A proponent of the concrete, Waller also furnished a wealth of narration and illustration, some of which is mirrored in accounts of life in the schools of our day. For instance, his descriptions of the struggles of teachers to maintain their authority in the face of renitent students can be found in various guises in recent ethnographies and case studies.

Waller did not have the advantage of the diverse and extensive empirical and theoretical literature now available in the social sciences and education. He died in 1945 before the lively postwar period in sociology marked by the contributions of such thinkers as Talcott Parsons and Waller's colleague at Columbia, Robert K. Merton. Waller sometimes drew on the social theory of his time, especially that of such scholars as W. I. Thomas, C. H. Cooley, William Graham Sumner, and Ellsworth Faris who was his teacher when he took his M.A. at Chicago. However, as Davis (1945) notes, Waller distrusted abstract theory. Indeed, Waller (1934) saw

commitment to a conceptual framework as a disadvantage in the kind of research he preferred, the case study.

Waller relied on this method and on his own experience in developing his ideas. Hill (1968:444) commented that "perhaps no sociologist of his generation distilled more imaginative sociology out of personal experience." Waller's experience in education included six years as a teacher of French and Latin in a military high school. His father was a school superintendent who held a number of different positions. Of Waller's experience as a student in the public schools, we know little other than that he was apparently a successful pupil even though he moved a lot because of his father's job changes. The adult Waller told friends he became skilled as a boxer because as the superintendent's son he was drawn into fights with other boys (Goode, Furstenberg & Mitchell, 1970:8-9).

How typical was Waller's experience? He was a student in the small town and rural schools of mid-America and the papers he got from teachers as a college professor at Nebraska and Penn State and sometimes used to illustrate his ideas, were drawn from similar settings. Also, Waller's experience as a secondary school teacher in a military school could well have featured more than the usual regimentation of students. Beyond this limitation of place is that of time. Waller graduated from high school in 1915 and he taught high school from 1920 to 1926. His main work on education was published just six years later (Waller, 1932). Since then substantial changes have occurred in society and in education. Hence, some of what Waller wrote about teachers and schools is overdrawn and often unduly grim (Charters, 1963). As Goode, Furstenberg, and Mitchell (1970:39) put it, "The atmosphere of the book now seems a bit old-fashioned, in the same way that Dreiser or Sinclair Lewis now seem

old-fashioned." At the same time, Charters and Goode and his colleagues would agree that Waller's penetrating treatment of the school is highly relevant to contemporary scholarship.

Such relevance is all the more remarkable in view of Waller's emphasis on the description of particular situations and his lack of attention to systematic theory. It suggests the possibility that despite the transformations of time, schools have not changed substantially, at least in some important respects. In any event, Waller was a scholar whose seminal work on schools needs to be savored but also questioned, elaborated, and refined. Put another way, it needs to be both appreciated and criticized just as Waller's writings on the school were an appreciation of the social interaction and personal dramas played out there, as well as a criticism of things that were not right.

The rest of this paper is divided into four sections. The first two explore Waller's thought and its implications for school life in intraorganizational terms, first with regard to internal relationships among participants, then in connection with school cultures. The third examines environmental influences while the fourth deals with Waller's vision of what schools ought to be, his thoughts on implementation, and the connection between his recommendations and his analysis.

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONS: INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

Waller appreciated the uniqueness and contingencies that mark persons and settings. He even stated that "the important things that happen in the schools result from the interaction of personalities" (1932:1). Nevertheless, Waller intended, by exploring concrete cases, to provide insights into "the typical school" (1932:Preface). His interpretive and

analytic attention centered on the school as a social organization and on social roles, especially that of the teacher.

Despotism and Domination

Waller (1932:8-12, 192-202; 1942:206-08) saw the school as an instrument of mass education that leaves the students frustrated by constraints that affront their spontaneous natures and by a course of study devoted to arcane knowledge unrelated to their interests. In these circumstances the school becomes a despotism that demands student conformity, yet is restrained by the legal and normative codes of the community. However limited, the school's despotism is reinforced by the continual threat of breakdowns in its own system of internal controls and by citizen intervention. In Waller's well known phrase, the school is "a despotism in a state of perilous equilibrium" (1932:10).

In such a setting the teachers must be able to dominate the students and a number of descriptions of teachers' efforts to do so are featured in Waller. Dominance is connected with maintaining social distance, achieving a certain dignity reflected in such things as voice and dress, and the use of devices like anger (1932:205-07, 388). However, even when it is attained, dominance is not assured. The teachers and the students are on opposing sides. Conflict and resistance lie just below even tranquil surfaces, waiting to be triggered by an often unexpected event. Changing modifiers, Waller refers to the teacher-student relationship as an unstable one in "quivering equilibrium" (1932:383).

Teachers develop a personality, to use Waller's word, that is impersonal and domineering. A teacher stereotype that emphasizes authoritarianism abets and helps sustain that development. The teacher

personality is geared to what Waller (1932:189-210) labels institutional leadership, the leadership of authority and compulsion that pervades the school. Teachers, even idealistic ones, fall back on formalism and the support of their own primary group. "The significant people for a school teacher are other teachers," Waller (1932:389) asserted.

However, all this has costs. Waller saw the teacher personality as a diminution, a kind of occupational warping of the individual. He stated that "one has become a school teacher when he has learned to fear the loss of his dignity" (1932:389), but Waller also argued that dignity can destroy the human element in social relationships. This brings us to the dilemma that Waller suggested and Bidwell (1965:especially 978-980) highlighted in his discussion of Waller's work: in carrying out the main tasks of teaching--motivating students and maintaining order--the friendliness and warmth that promotes the first are incompatible with the demands of the second. In Waller's analysis, order wins out.

All sorts of questions can be raised about Waller's depiction of the school as a despotic organization and of the struggle of teachers to dominate students. Charters (1963:762), for instance, criticized Waller's presupposition that universal teacher-student conflict stems from students' lack of intrinsic motivation to learn, pointing out that in certain circumstances motivation could be high.

While teacher-student conflict in Waller does not seem to me to be merely a matter of the absence of student motivation, Charters was clearly correct to emphasize contingencies. A useful strategy is to treat certain of Waller's concepts as variables. Rather than ask whether schools are typically despotic, it makes more theoretical sense to develop explanations of the circumstances under which schools exhibit different levels of

despotism or authoritarianism, to use a less colorful word. High student motivation is likely to be associated with reduced despotism as Charters suggested, but so might be other factors such as type of school and community cultures, various student, teacher, and administrator characteristics, and the intensity of the school's overload problems as represented by student-teacher ratios, the physical layout of the building as it relates to student pursuits, and the range of duties assigned to teachers.

Still, Waller's portrait of the school as typically preoccupied with order and the maintenance of adult domination of students has to be taken very seriously. Studies over the years done in a variety of settings have come to similar conclusions (Becker, 1953; Cusick, 1983; Gordon, 1957; Metz, 1978; Willower & Jones, 1967). This suggests that schools have remained remarkably stable in at least some ways over the past 55 years. Thus, now as then the school is called upon to teach dominant adult values as well as academic subjects, now as then the main interests of the bulk of the students are far from those of the school's teachers and its curriculum (Peshkin, 1978; Stinchcombe, 1964), now as then students are commonly taught by a single teacher in a classroom with 20 to 30 or more other pupils in a building that contains many such classrooms. The dominant values that are stressed include those in the "hidden curriculum" of good manners, cooperation, and conformity, reflecting adult aims but not student interests. The overload factor, which is not emphasized in Waller or, for that matter, in a lot of current sociological treatments of the school, deserves more attention. Batch processing, rules governing student behavior, elaborate logistical arrangements, and other forms of

routinization can be seen as efforts to make multiple activities, substantial variety, and high population density more manageable.

An additional reason for the staying power of Waller's depiction of the school can be found in the legitimation society accords to efforts to direct and control the young. This legitimation has several facets. One stems from the societal belief that the young and inexperienced should be guided by adults, what Stinchcombe (1964:181) called the doctrine of the inferiority of the young. This is readily translatable as the inferiority of the student; and teachers are, after all, older, more experienced, and presumably wiser than their students. Related is the general agreement of parents that schools should provide orderly environments for learning and should transmit widely held community values including respect for one's elders. Another stems from the official status of the school as an agency of the government, regulated by law, and staffed by credentialed personnel (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, 1978; Meyer & Scott, 1983).

In summary, a number of durable organizational features plus broad gauged legitimation of the school's stewardship over its pupils have preserved over time important elements of what Waller called despotism and domination. Of course, the idiom has shifted and some of Waller's language now sounds out-of-date. Similarly, many of the mechanisms of student control have changed over time. Tyler (1985:69) believes that they have become more indirect and less visible. In addition to work that treats concepts as variables and attends to contingencies, work that is essential if Waller's thought is to become a better theoretical stepping stone, descriptive field studies that can get at subtleties of the kind Tyler suggests can make useful contributions.

It would also be helpful if certain concepts that are implicit in Waller's argument but have been developed more fully since his time could be better operationalized for research use. Examples are legitimation and goal displacement (Merton, 1968). Both are analytically powerful concepts that are underdeveloped empirically.

Issues concerning the former concept include the kinds of actions that affect the levels of the school's legitimacy among its various constituencies and whether legitimacy is differentially attained in different groups, the boundaries and gray areas of legitimation, and the extent to which legitimacy is affected by the school's academic or other successes and failures. Issues concerning the latter concept center on the conditions under which student control goals displace other goals such as instructional ones.

Teachers: Personality and the Work

Waller's notion of a teacher personality has already been briefly explored. This distant, domineering, rather formal, inflexible, and fussy personality restrained in its spontaneity and enthusiasms arises in Waller's (1932:375-409) view because of selection, the attitudes and behavior played out in the work of teaching, the effects of community opinion, and traumatic learning in the occupation.

Community opinion is bound up with the authoritarian teacher stereotype that can leave a reproductive mark on the personality in the manner of Cooley's (1902:183-84) looking-glass self, thereby furthering what Waller called "the relentless march of growing teacherishness" (1932:375). Probably more important, however, is the work itself which requires that constant attention be given to the students and to a host of

routines. Also part of the picture are the influence of the teacher group and the ever present possibility of an embarrassing incident or even the loss of pupil control, Waller's traumatic learning. These factors all figure in Waller's analysis of what teaching does to teachers and how, over time, individuals are marked by their work as they internalize a social role.

However, Waller did not contend that the teacher personality he described was universal. He recognized other possibilities. One was based on what he called the second teacher stereotype, that of the dedicated, self-sacrificing, self-effacing, more kindly individual, although Waller thought that the second stereotype reflected the community's idea of what a teacher ought to be while the domineering one represented community opinion of reality. Waller believed that teachers were "imprisoned within the stereotype" (1932:420). Put another way, stereotypes function as role expectations and, it might be added, they also can attract or repel occupational choice (Charters, 1963:760-61).

The teacher personality (and stereotypes) he described were clearly distasteful to Waller and he recommended better selection and that the community treat teachers outside of school as persons, not as teachers (1932:448-59). He also explored the ways in which some teachers are able to avoid the extremes of the teacher personality. According to Waller (1942:212-15), "good" teachers can blend social distance with friendliness and authority with compassion, they can be demanding but can relax, they know when to enforce a rule and when to look the other way, and they are expert conciliators, whether granting small concessions or making gestures of group solidarity by participating in a student activity. Such teachers have mastered the art of knowing when and how and by how much to reduce the

domination and control of students, cultivating positive relationships despite the fundamental hierarchial gap. Here, Waller's description is close to that of the proverbial firm but fair teacher and akin to the depiction by the teachers in Lortie's (1975) study of their outstanding colleagues as popular with students but also demanding of them.

Roughly translated, Waller's message seems to be that while the school's social arrangements tend to produce a teacher personality that is dour and domineering, something better is possible and is displayed by at least some teachers. These same considerations bear on the dilemma in Waller concerning motivation and order that Bidwell underscored; some teachers can manage to produce both. However, such teachers are almost aberrations in Waller and are prestigious but not common in Lortie and both emphasize that these teachers retain mastery in their classrooms. Thus, life in schools can have a softer and more human side but the basic relationships and the proscriptions concerning disorder endure.

While Waller sensibly hedged his generalization of the teacher personality, questions remain even if, as also seems sensible, we drop the term personality altogether. Thus, one can simply ask whether the work of teaching fosters the development of certain attitudes and behaviors. If so, how deeply are they internalized? Do they carry over when teachers move to different school positions such as the principalship? Do they extend to other spheres of teachers' lives? Do "good" teachers differ from the rest along these lines?

Of course, since Waller's time there has been a great deal of research on teacher characteristics, some of it emphasizing contingencies and the fit between teacher and student types. A review of that research is beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say that the interaction between

work and the individual and how each shapes the other is not yet perfectly understood.

Waller emphasized work constraints that channel teacher behavior toward students. An important issue is the breadth of that channel and the range of the styles, strategies, and scripts employed by the teachers who negotiate it. The broader that range, despite probable functional equivalencies within it, the less plausible the common personality notion. What does seem to be quite common among teachers is their desire for good pupil control, success with students, and as much autonomy as possible. Teachers generally know the rules of the game and normally stay within them, thus helping to preserve their autonomy. The means they use to attain ascendancy in their classrooms seem likely to be those that they feel comfortable with and perceive as successful, but which fall within their understanding of the rules of the game. The nature of the constraints perceived by today's teachers, how they handle them, and the ways in which they attempt to preserve their personal leeway are all topics that need more empirical attention. Waller spoke directly and extensively to the first two of these topics and the third was important to him as an ideal, but it was a limited commodity among the teachers he wrote about.

Some Changes

Among the changes in schools that have taken place since Waller's time are a few that have implications for his analysis. One is increased differentiation and specialization within schools. Another is the growth of teachers' power as a result of professionalization, unionization, and social changes such as the advancement of gender equity. Still another is a renewed emphasis on school effectiveness and technical legitimation.

Since Waller wrote, school districts in the United States have undergone a period of centralization becoming fewer and bigger. This and the emergence of some new occupations in education have led to increased differentiation and specialization in schools. Pupil personnel services with guidance counselors, special educators, and school psychologists illustrate the point. Although Waller (1932:456-58) recommended that the schools should make psychological services available to students (and teachers), such services were then virtually nonexistent in schools. Their coming brought some diffusion of authority and a concomitant reduction in teachers' discretion. A certain amount of conflict between teachers and specialists can result, but the trade-offs include assistance to teachers with difficult students, clinically-based definitions of student deviance and disorder, the protection afforded teachers in certain cases of parental intervention, and an additional kind of legitimation for pupil control. These outcomes are consistent with Waller's notions of despotism and domination, but they exemplify more subtle mechanisms of control than were typical in his day.

As part of the general trend toward specialization in schools, teachers have themselves become more specialized and are far better prepared than their predecessors. At the same time, the teachers' associations which in Waller's day included school administrators in their leadership are now, in effect, unions headed by teachers and dedicated to the protection and empowerment of their members. They have been quite successful in these undertakings and the contracts they negotiated have often bureaucratized what had previously been areas of administrator discretion.

School administrators are a hierarchically differentiated group that has proliferated as school districts have increased in size. Waller (1932:93-102) saw administrators largely in terms of their relationships with the community and school board, relationships that provided more opportunities to make enemies than friends and often ended with the school executive moving on to go through a similar process with a new community and board (much as Waller's father had). Waller explicitly stated that the task of school administration was to blend "learning processes in such a way as to satisfy community pressures upon the school and at the same time to furnish the child a rounded educational development" (1938:452). Despite a petulant statement in an article written for a popular magazine where he called those who supervise teachers a collection of nitwits and worse (1943), Waller was generally sympathetic towards school administrators, portraying them as often being as honest and progressive as they dared to be (1938:460). He saw both administrators and teachers as vulnerable subjects of the community.

According to Waller, teachers react to school executives with an ambivalence that blends loyalty and latent rebellion. He wryly added the suspicion that these executives' definition of the professional ethics of teachers was "loyalty under another name" (1932:425). However, administrator control of teachers was not a major theme in Waller. Brought up in an area known for its separate elementary and secondary school districts, each with its own board and (elementary or high school) superintendent, Waller typically referred to school superintendents and less often to principals. When administrators appeared in his case studies, they were usually called superintendents and were the only administrators mentioned. There were no complex tables of organization, no

specialized administrators, and certainly no union representatives in Waller's rural and small town schools of the 1920s and 1930s. Gender equity was not recognized and women teachers had to remain unmarried to keep their jobs. If teachers were able to muster influence it usually stemmed from community support for particular teachers and the accessibility of small town school board members to both those supporters and to teachers.

Waller's school administrators were public servants and the politicians of education. Their job was to articulate and implement community expectations in their organizations and to convince the community and specifically the school board that the expectations were being met and that any new ideas or plans of the administrator were consistent with those expectations. Because of the moral focus of community expectations for the school, technical effectiveness in Waller as in the current writing of Meyer and Rowan (1977; 1978), was secondary to normative appropriateness.

Today's administrators are still politicans but they bring their message to teachers who are protected by a union contract, who are conscious of the rights of all teachers including women teachers and willing to insist upon them, and who are able to claim increased legitimacy as instructional specialists because of their attainment of higher levels of training. All this is likely to spawn new adaptations featuring trade-offs, exchanges, and more subtle processes of control and accountability.

However, the school's fundamental hierarchical arrangements remain. The board of education and school administrators still exert their authority over faculty although they are now careful to do so with the legal codes and due process in mind. Although the nature of the standards

has changed considerably over the years, teachers who violate key community norms still face negative sanctions that can be severe (Stetter & Willower, 1985; Ziolkowski & Willower, 1987). Waller's (1932:34) characterization of schools as museums of virtue continues to be close to the mark even though the gap between the standards applied to teachers and those applied to ordinary citizens has narrowed.

Teacher credibility in the classroom is still tied to effective pupil control much as Waller had it. However, pupil control is increasingly viewed as a prerequisite to learning, not as an end-in-itself. The effective schools movement has refocused attention on student outcomes primarily along the lines of subject matter achievement. This is a topic that Waller for the most part ignored. If technical effectiveness really were to catch on in schools, it is possible that the domination of students that Waller described would be redefined in terms of organizing and carrying out tasks that resulted in student gains. In any case, it no longer seems safe to think of technical effectiveness in schools as merely a myth.

Using Gouldner's (1954) conception of bureaucratic types, Bidwell (1965) argued that while Waller depicted the school as a punishment-centered bureaucracy, it fitted the representative model better. I suggested that given the differences in values and ends between teachers and students and the one-way enforcement of rules, elements of Gouldner's definition, schools were more punishment-centered at the level of the teacher-student relationship but more representative at the level of the teacher-administrator relationship (Willower, 1967). Twenty years later, I remain skeptical about the utility of bureaucratic theory in general and Gouldner's typology in particular in examining educational organizations.

However, I recognize the possibility that schools will become more oriented to the technology of teaching and to student outcomes, directing the attention of teachers, administrators, and specialists alike to organizational goals, something not too distant from Gouldner's representative type. However, this kind of rational linkage of means and ends will be problematic in settings where the school has not successfully accommodated the community norms that Waller emphasized, especially if a lot of energy has to be expended coping with externally generated conflict. Furthermore, the right kind of organizational culture is crucial.

SCHOOL CULTURE

If Waller's treatment of intraorganizational relations captured features of school life that are still basic and relevant despite some language and illustrations that now seem quaint and exaggerated, his exploration of school cultures is, if anything, more relevant, a pioneering and now classic effort.

The concept of culture has been applied to school organizations in a number of ways. The traditional one emphasizes the part played by schools as agencies of cultural transmission for the society, another sees schools as a class of organizations having similar socio-cultural systems, while still another attends to the separate subcultures within those organizations. More recently, the idea that individual organizations have peculiar cultures of their own has become popular, especially in writing on business firms (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Ouchi, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982). All of the applications can be found in Waller although his terminology sometimes differed from that just used.

Two features of Waller's quite extensive treatment of culture in schools deserve special attention. One is the clash of the teacher and student groups or subcultures and the other is the wide range of activities, often ceremonial in nature, that promote the identification of the student with the school.

Clashing Subcultures

The opposition of the teachers and students, Waller's (1932:109-110) "fighting groups," has already been discussed. Tied to this opposition are values and norms, sometimes referred to by Waller as morality and codes, that characterize each group.

Teachers

Waller emphasized that teachers have the task of imposing preexisting community standards on students. Teachers are, in his words, "paid agents of cultural diffusion" (1932:40). As such they represent the adult world to students, a world full of demands and restraints. This alienates the students, an alienation exacerbated by the fact that the teachers not only impart standards but also commonly exemplify them.

Beyond these community standards is another code of conduct for teachers which stems form the teacher group itself, the norms of what we might now call the teacher subculture. These norms revolve largely around the maintenance of social distance and the domination of the teachers over the students. Thus, teachers must not become too friendly with students; they "must not speak ill of their colleagues in the presence of students, nor must they permit students to criticize their colleagues to them" (1932:428). According to Waller, the reason for the proscription of

criticism is that a teacher who violates it can break the circle of reinforcement upon which teacher domination rests. A parallel belief among teachers is that school administrators should back their teachers up.

Related to the maintenance of social distance is what Waller called a taboo in the teacher group against seeking popularity among the students, a taboo that operates with special force if it is thought that popularity seeking is complicated by disloyalty to one's colleagues (1932:109). Waller asserted that teachers behave ceremoniously toward each other and the administrators of the school and called this "the ceremoniousness of a fighting group which does not care to endanger its prestige with underlings by allowing any informality to arise within itself" (1932:109). Also included in Waller's description of the teacher group were a number of illustrations of what might be called teaching lore, for instance, the injunction to start out tough because it's easier to loosen up than the other way around. Waller's depiction of the teacher subculture is consistent with his general analysis of the school. The norms of the teacher group fit the theme of domination that he advanced.

Many of the illustrations Waller used have a familiar ring. To give just one example, his comments on ceremoniousness reminded me of a phenomenon noted in a field study (Willower, 1971b) conducted some years ago. The teachers in the school studied addressed one another using formal titles like Mr. or Mrs. when students were nearby even if they had been using first names only minutes earlier.

The usual criticism of analyses of collectivities is that internal differentiation and individuality are slighted. Thus, Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) recently argued that it is a mistake to speak of a teacher culture, that one should speak of cultures of teaching. Obviously they are

right in the sense that teachers differ from school to school and from one another. Waller made a similar point (1932:108) but he also recognized the utility of exploring commonalities that might furnish sociological insights. These are trade-offs that are common in inquiry; the point is to be aware of them.

A difficulty I have with Waller's work on the teacher group is his failure to emphasize an autonomy norm. It is, of course, possible that he did not do so because such a norm was weak when he wrote about teachers, but it is also the case that autonomy does not fit his conception of a fighting group very well. I suggested earlier that teachers preserve their autonomy by sticking to the rules of the game and avoiding noticeable deviation. Put another way, teacher autonomy has limits and Waller tended to emphasize limits and constraints. Still, the operation of the autonomy norm in the teacher group could reduce the strength of teacher subcultures (Willower & Smith, 1986-87). Treating that concept as a variable, the strength of the teacher subculture could be examined in relation to such other variables as the strength of the autonomy norm and the degree of actual teacher autonomy as well as to factors that might build group cohesiveness such as threat.

Students

A student subculture begins to develop early. Waller (1932:178) stated that the teacher may be a "mother substitute" for the first few years but after that students become more attached to their peers as teachers become more impersonal and dominant. One gauge of a budding student subculture is the anti-stool pigeon norm (Willower, 1971a). In the early grades students regularly tell tales on their peers, but around grade

four this behavior reverses as the norm starts to take hold. Waller called this norm, which forbids giving a teacher information that could lead to the punishment of another student, the schoolboy code and presented it as part of the "morality of a fighting group" (1932:110). He also pointed out that there are norms for social distance in the student group as well as in the teacher group. Students are not supposed to like their teachers too much or get too close to them.

Waller noted that students divide into a variety of diverse cliques and subgroups. These divisions are, in part, based on age and grade and, in part, on interests, activities, and social class. Waller's treatment of student primary groups anticipated current work. For instance, his discussion of adolescent and preadolescent courtship in schools has similar qualities to Peshkin's (1978) well regarded study that explored, among other things, student romance and fantasy in a small town high school. Waller also called attention to the special roles played by students in their groups and classes, roles such as leader, athlete, goat, man about town, clown, and orator. These appear in many later investigations, although the terms are usually different (e.g., Tarr, 1977). Waller's depiction of students also included the often transitory fads, frequently of speech or clothing, that mark these groups, as well as their myths and stories and, especially in the case of gangs and certain clubs, the ordeals of initiation and participation.

While student norms often directly protect pupils against the school's adults, other elements of the subculture reflect the adversarial nature of the school's main groups in sometimes creative ways. Waller described war stories in which students outsmarted their teachers and principals, tales in which the enemy was invested with special powers or exceptional

characteristics like the teacher rumored to have killed a man in a boxing match, the teacher with a glass eye, or the principal with an artificial foot, and much mimicing and satirizing of faculty mannerisms. Again, Waller was ahead of his time since the study of stories has only recently become more common in the literature on culture and organizations. At the same time, Waller failed to explore humor in depth in his examination of the student and the teacher groups although he was aware that the topic was important and apologized for his cursory treatment of it (1932:349).

The student group exhibits substantial diversity in the sense that it is composed of a variety of subgroups having a variety of roles. It has a protean quality that is connected with the transitory fads and fashions that students adopt and drop and the movement of students up the age-grade ladder with its attendant learning of new ways and rejection of old ones. Waller recognized these qualities in the student group, but his portrayal of it emphasized the community sanctioned and organizationally defined subjection of students and the resulting protective character of the group's normative and behavioral dispositions.

There is little doubt that student subgroups differ in the degree to which they are willing to accept adult orientations to in-school learning (see, e.g., Hargreaves, 1967). However, most studies of student subcultures show that, although students and teachers may not be as intensively at war as Waller had them, they are clearly on opposite sides. Clearer still in these studies is the overriding importance to students of their peer group and of a range of activities that are shared with peers, but are not related to the formal purposes of the school (Coleman, 1961; Cusick, 1973; Peshkin, 1978; Tarr, 1977; Willis, 1977). Putting all this another way, Waller recognized student diversity but emphasized the common

student culture shaped by subjugation and expressed both in opposition to the adult system and commitment to peers and a peer agenda. The research essentially backs Waller but gives less emphasis than he did to overt opposition and more to peer interests.

It is possible that the more recent student subculture studies reflect changes in pupil control mechanisms including more clinical approaches to student misconduct and the segregation of the disruptive in designated classes or curricula. Another influence that has emerged since Waller's time stems from the dramatic expansion of the mass media, especially television, providing for the young common, if desultory, frames of reference that feed peer but not school interests.

Waller contended that students were frustrated by school; psychologists tell us that aggression and withdrawal are common responses to frustration. Perhaps students are becoming less aggressive toward teachers and more mentally withdrawn from school. This would fit a pattern of indifference to the school and the replacement of its agenda with that of the peer group. It is possible that some teachers encourage such a response. An example would be the teachers in Cusick's (1983) study whose object was to keep the kids happy and orderly even if academics had to be deemphasized. In short, student inability to cope with more subtle controls, along with the content of the mass media and the norms of the peer group, reinforce indifference as a student response to formal learning in school, a response tacitly accepted by some teachers.

A Note on Administrators

The school's largest groups, the teachers and the students, have been discussed because these are the groups that received most of Waller's

attention. However, it should be noted that the array of concepts usually employed in cultural analysis--shared meanings and values, norms, a collective language and rhetoric, prestige and status relations, socialization, and more--can be applied to the school administrator group. Waller tended to think of school executives as rather solitary figures and did not proceed along these lines. I have explored the idea of such a subculture elsewhere (Willower, 1986a) and wish only to make note of it here. Suffice it to say that politics, vulnerability, conflict, the pace of administrative work, humor that functions to provide social support, and prestige and power all appear to be part of the picture, but the empirical work has been very sparse.

Bringing Students In

Waller examined in some detail the pattern of school activities and ceremonies that serve to promote the identification of the student with the school (1932:112-31). These activities represent the "faculty's attempt to make school life interesting and to extend the influence of the school" (1932:112). Waller emphasized the control function of activities. They provide outlets for youthful energies, substitutes for forbidden pursuits, lessons in sportsmanship and citizenship, and they bring the students in by capturing their attention and interest, all within a framework of adult jurisdiction and supervision.

Athletics is foremost among all of the activities. Competition with other schools in various sports, with football preeminent among them, provides opportunities for spontaneous student identification with the team and the school. Such contests also serve to unify the various cliques and groups associated with the school. The organized pageantry surrounding

such games and the pep rallies that precede them, including cheers and songs, is meant to stir emotion and as Waller wryly remarked, it "gives the student body an enemy to hate that is not on the faculty" (1932:125). Symbols such as school colors, banners, mascots, emblems, and trophies play a part in a variety of school ceremonies including those connected with athletics. Waller discussed a number of ceremonies including, among others, those devoted to scholastic recognition, morale, school spirit, and martyrdom, the last honoring someone who suffered in some way for the school. He also considered the schools' numerous club and interest activities and such things as opening exercises and ritualized interactions.

Some of the lesser activities and ceremonies in Waller have changed considerably since he wrote. For instance, school public address systems have remade opening exercises. Oddly, given his emphasis on schools as repositories of societal values, he did not emphasize ceremonies designed to shape student values and conduct in adult modes. Often, these take the form of exhorations by principals as part of assemblies. Sometimes, whole assemblies are devoted to them as when school or other officials discuss crime, drug use, or more recently, drunk driving. In any case, the activities and ceremonies that Waller saw as most important, those connected with athletics, seem stronger than ever, perhaps assisted by the widespread attention given athletics through television. At the same time, today's students, children of television, are likely to take a more worldly and more cynical view of school activities than the students of the 1930s. This raises this issue of what makes school activities effective, not an easy issue to research since the theoretically most interesting outcomes of the activities are latent functions such as social cohesion or

identification with the organization. In any case, there has been very little attention given the topic since Waller wrote about it.

Bidwell (1965) raised the issue of unanticipated consequences, asking whether an emphasis on activities legitimates the academically indifferent and alienates students further from the central goals of the school. Waller argued that activities made school life more interesting and increased student identification with the school. Presumably, this results in students who are more rather than less committed to the school's academic goals and at least keeps the academically indifferent student from substantial estrangement by providing what Carlson (1964) called side-payments. What is required is a better understanding of student orientations to school that includes the influences of the peer group and the mass media, especially television. The next step would be investigations of how these orientations interact with different kinds of activities that could affect commitments both to the school and to its purposes.

Organizational Culture

Bringing participants into a closer relationship with the organization, increasing identification with the organization, and enhancing commitments to organizational goals are all part of building an organizational culture. The idea that a particular organization has a peculiar culture of its own is another of the many applications of that concept stemming from the recognition that culture provides a useful interpretive framework for all social systems, not just societies. A distinctive feature of the organizational culture perspective is its focus on change. Its basic concern is building better organizational cultures,

that is cultures in which high levels of cohesion and unity are attained in behalf of organizational goals.

I have argued in several papers (e.g., Willower, 1986b) that schools have characteristics that make the development of organizational cultures problematic. Examples are the existence of antithetical teacher and student groups and the fact that, while most organizations have only the problem of motivating employees to produce a quality product, schools have that problem, but must also motivate the product.

Waller laid out both the nature of the oppositional groups and the main ways he believed "we feelings" could be developed in schools, the activities and ceremonies just discussed. In addition, he sketched his vision of a better school based on less artificial tasks and greater freedom for students (to be discussed later) that he believed would engage students and faculty in new and healthier ways. However, Waller saw that in reality athletics was the school's chief unifying force. A recent field study (Willower & Smith, 1986-87) suggests two reservations. The first is that it is winning teams that are a unifying force, the second is that even in those circumstances many teachers are concerned about the "tail wagging the dog" when it comes to athletics and academics.

In any case, given the nature of the teacher and student groups, it seems unlikely that schools will have strong organizational cultures outside of some special circumstances or deliberate efforts. Community pressures could provide the special circumstances and the kind of principal described in the effective schools literature, an energetic leader who constantly emphasizes instruction, could expend the deliberate efforts. However, even in favorable circumstances, many questions remain. For instance, what would be the area of intersection of the values and norms of

the school's constituent groups? My guess is that widespread congruity would be unlikely, but that agreement in certain areas would be possible. School spirit and the value of learning seem to be good candidates since they both would enjoy widespread legitimacy as aims.

The connection between a strong culture and student achievement outcomes is, of course, not clear. It makes sense to predict a positive relationship especially in an organization where motivation is so central, but many other factors enter in. For instance, a strong culture devoted to athletics with weak student achievement is a distinct possibility, particularly since such a culture would probably enjoy legitimacy in the community. Another configuration would be that of the school with a weak culture but high student outcomes spurred by family and career aspirations.

In addition, a strong school culture could exhibit tunnel vision fixed on a single aim to the exclusion of others, say on achievement in school subjects rather than on the development of critical thinking, or a favorite of Waller's, a wholesome and insightful personality. There are also intrinsic problems with strong cultures since they typically elicit conformity and might limit dissent and be restrictive to their members. Maintaining cultures that are open, educative, and not subtlely oppressive is a major concern.

Discerning efforts to build organizational cultures would likely be based on educational aims, drawing on the increased professionalism of teachers and their historical commitment to high purpose, along with a principal who at least borders on Max Weber's charismatic type. The drawbacks here are the staying power of a culture dependent on a leader whose tenure may be limited, the dissent-smothering dangers of charisma,

and, perhaps most important, the ever present question of how to bring the students in.

Waller's main contributions here are his delineation of the opposing teacher and student groups and his examination of activities and ceremonies that promote student identification with the school. The first stands as a warning to anyone who naively sees culture building in schools as either easy or as a panacea, while the second suggests that bringing students in is not an impossibility.

My sense of school organizations today is that, while teachers are still committed to pupil control norms, they are often not the fighting group that Waller depicted. The autonomy norm, the isolation of the classroom, role overload, and union protection may have contributed to fragmentation of the teacher group, something found in the very small number of schools studied by Cusick (1983) and by Smith and me (Willower & Smith, 1986-87). It is possible that Waller underestimated the extent to which students might be responsive to affectively-oriented connections to learning and academics. Weak teacher and student groups might make it possible for organizational culture to germinate, an unlikely event in the face of "fighting groups."

School cultures remain a potentially fertile area of research. If, as I suggested, organizational cultures with high legitimacy and the support of the teachers and the community will be geared to instructional purposes, we need especially to know more about the technology of teaching, both as a social and task-oriented activity, and how it can become an integral part of the socio-cultural life of the school.

THE ORGANIZATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

It has already been made clear that Waller saw the school "as a microcosm that mirrors the macrocosm" (1932:16) represented by the society and the community. While he held this view in common with later institutional organization and reproduction theorists, his position differed from the former in that he did not see legitimation as ritualistic. He did not use the word, but he saw legitimation as continually threatened. He differed from most reproduction theorists in that his treatment of the school as a sorting mechanism recognized inequality based on wealth and connections, but saw the American system of social classes as "more or less open" (1932:23) and in his contention that injustice and arbitrary power can be found in both capitalist and socialist societies.

Vulnerability

Waller (1932; 1938) recognized the diversity of the community groups that made claims on the school, but he depicted the community as unfailingly conservative and the school and its personnel as inevitably vulnerable. Teachers resided in the community as sociological strangers because of their educations and because they were required to live within the stereotype imposed by the community. Waller's stories of the travails of teachers living in rented rooms in small towns under the suspicious watch of their landlords and the rest of the community are markedly out-of-date. As indicated earlier, the difference between expectations for teachers and others is not nearly as great as it was in Waller's day. Indeed, Abbott and Stuart (1969) claim that since then teacher anxieties have shifted from their image in the community toward intraorganizational concerns.

None of this means that anything goes as far as teachers are concerned. There is still the element of the sacred charge in education. The schools are, after all, given a precious social resource, the youth of the society, to teach and shape. The school's stewardship over the young means that the community will be sensitive to deviant behavior by school employees, but expectations are now more particularistic and more directed to one's work. Today, a teacher who is overtly hostile toward students or uses Draconian forms of control in the classroom is more likely to face negative sanctions than one involved in outside behavior that in Waller's time might have meant dismissal. As an agency that socializes the young, the school is something of a secular church, but current issues are more likely to concern doctrines taught than the morals of the clergy. Put another way, parents and the community are more attentive to the content of the sex education courses than to the sex lives of the teachers.

Despite his Dickensian portrait of an intolerant citizenry imposing a narrow morality on its teachers, Waller turns out, as is often the case, to be on target in many of the essentials. Thus, teachers are still supposed to be good examples to their students in matters of morality and schools are organizations that are especially vulnerable to environmental interventions.

Waller saw this vulnerability reflected in both conformity and conflict. The first was the tendency of the school to adhere to and promote community standards that enjoyed wide acceptance. The second was represented in relationships such as that between teachers and parents, groups Waller called "natural enemies" (1932:68) and between the school superintendent and the board of education. He catalogued prevalent kinds of conflict for both relationships and described ways in which astute

teachers and administrators handled such situations. Waller also pointed out that the school was a focal point for community conflict. He wrote that "conflict groups. . . reach out their hands toward the public schools. The list of those who have sought to use the tax-supported schools as channels for their doctrines is almost as long as the list of those who have axes to grind" (1932:16).

The school's environment as Waller depicted it was not homogeneous. He argued that society was characterized by culture conflict and stated that "our educational institutions necessarily reflect this cultural heterogeneity" (1938:453). The schools echoed the political characters of their communities, but Waller thought that they tilted markedly in a conservative direction seeking the safety of the non-controversial and steering clear of anything that might offend significant elements of their constituencies.

Since then society has become more pluralistic but if Waller was correct, that pluralism will be reproduced slowly in the schools. This is likely not only because, as Waller stressed, the schools will stick to a core of widely accepted beliefs. In addition, faculty will make special efforts to inculcate the hidden curriculum since the values of hard work, deferred gratification, patriotism, and middle class manners reinforce the school's demands on students as organizational participants. Moreover, even parents who do not subscribe to dominant societal values might believe that their children's conformity to such values could facilitate upward mobility. These tendencies that deemphasize pluralism in the schools are buttressed externally by a common mass media, but also by the local control of schools that works as a kind of safety valve assuring that the schools will be responsive to local values even if they are atypical.

In any case, Waller's view that the schools reflect commonalities across a heterogeneous and politically changeable society should be differentiated from the view that the schools mirror a homogeneous society. Waller's perspective recognized the potential for conflict and the precariousness of the relationship of the school and its environment. He would likely be comfortable with approaches that emphasize organizational adaptations to the environment, for instance, Thompson's (1967) notion that organizational behavior can be understood in terms of the effort to reduce uncertainty and enhance predictability.

In Waller, the school adapts to the community, not the other way around. Social change could alter the ways in which schools are legitimated. For instance, it is possible that increased societal diversity along with changes discussed earlier such as greater internal specialization could promote legitimacy somewhat more oriented to technical effectiveness. Still, I am not suggesting that technical effectiveness as such will become the criterion of legitimacy. The public appears to judge the schools more globally. I believe that it is these global judgments of overall effectiveness that will increasingly provide legitimacy for particular schools in particular settings. Citizens typically neither understand nor care about school effects equations and they appear to assess student achievement results in a broad context. Many school administrators have intuitively understood this and have developed a rhetoric, termed a myth by students of the politics of education, that places education above politics, a most politic stance since that is where most citizens want the schools. Such rhetoric is commonly about good schools and service to children and it is global, forming a linguistic fit with the judgments citizens make, with the kinds of evaluations that can

reasonably be made of teaching, and with the kind of organizational culture building discussed earlier.

My guess is that to attain high levels of legitimacy, schools must do well on the technical side, Simon's (1958:xxv) concept of satisficing comes to mind, but must also generate perceptions of overall effectiveness in terms of broad educational aims including, as Waller would remind us, some that reflect community values. Putting some of this another way, I am suggesting that legitimacy for school organizations is a complex matter that goes well beyond teacher credentialing or student achievement scores. Much of this is, of course, conjectural. The whole area is ripe for theoretical and empirical attention.

Not So Fond Recollections

Next, a single argument of Waller's concerning the relation of the schools with members of the community is briefly considered. This argument was brought to my attention by Joseph Mateer, a doctoral student with whom I have been working.

It begins with the domination of the teacher and the subjugation of the student. From the relationship of domination and subjugation "arises a generalized conception of the school teacher which perdures in the minds of all the graduates of the school" (1932:59). Over time this conception becomes stereotypic and partly because of the limitations of memory, "an unpleasant and belittling caricature" (1932:59). In other words, the adult members of the community have lasting and somewhat exaggerated memories of teachers that affect their present opinions of teachers and presumably the school. According to Waller this means that "each generation of teachers pays in turn for the sins of the generation that has gone before"

(1932:59). Waller holds out the hope that "decades of sensible and friendly teaching" (1932:59) could result in a change, but contends that while the hostility that undergirds the memories may be mixed with a certain respect, that hostility is real and "apparently it is as universal as is the school itself" (1932:59). In addition to the negative attitudes towards teachers that these stereotyped memories foster, they also contribute to the lack of status and respect accorded teachers in the community.

In effect, Waller presented a social psychological theory that he applied to the opinions about teachers held by the members of the community, the formerly taught. The argument can be stated succinctly: school is a negative experience for students, and negative experiences can cause long lasting negative attitudes.

These ideas can be applied to various negative experiences occurring over a sustained period and to other authority figures such as police officers and even parents. The theory has a deeply psychological side that I am not prepared to comment on, but it is also bound up with the equalitarian beliefs and distrust of authority that mark American society.

The obvious issues are the extent to which negative experiences with certain members of a group in an organizational setting affect attitudes toward other members of that group in other settings, how long lasting such attitudes are, and assuming negative attitudes exist, what influences whether and how they will be expressed in behavior.

Waller's argument is not commonly found in texts on school-community relations nor in books on the sociology of education for that matter. It would not be difficult to do research on certain aspects of it. For instance, the hypothesis, the more negative the school experience, the more

negative the attitudes toward teachers and the school, and others like it could be readily tested. More intriguing, however, but more difficult to examine empirically, would be the notion that readiness to criticize the schools, seemingly an American trait, is related to latent hostility generated during the student experience.

VISION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Waller could be bitingly critical as he often was of teachers and schools. He pictured the school curriculum as largely artificial and teachers as narrowed and dehumanized by their work. However, he also presented his vision of a better school and of the good teacher along with a number of specific recommendations for change.

General Orientation

Before considering Waller's views of what school organizations ought to be, I want to explore his general orientation to reform and social change. Waller's reputation is that of a sociologist interested in improving society. Farber (1967:xvii-xix) wrote that "Waller displays a commitment to reform. Throughout his career, he viewed sociology as more than either a discipline which applies objective methodology to human society or a humanistic study of human relations merely to produce understanding. Rather, Waller was concerned with sociology as providing solutions to major problems in society." And Davis (1945:698) stated that Waller "felt that sociological insight and research should be brought to bear on the solution of vital problems facing all mankind, and he attemped in his own work to carry out his conviction."

I would call Waller a philosophical nominalist and he called himself a realistic sociologist. Any confusion the juxtaposition of these labels might cause lies in the terminological reversals sometimes found in different disciplines, for to Waller, to be realistic was to be concrete. Waller's way of looking at things was to see particulars, whether particular illustrative cases and events or particular social injustices. His nominalistic bent included not only the distrust of abstract theorizing noted at the beginning of this essay but also a distrust of abstract, utopian approaches to the reform of social institutions. I agree with Goode, Furstenberg and Mitchell's (1970:95) assessment that Waller was a moralist who "saw himself as a tough-minded realist, unencumbered by ideological baggage" and who had no systematic philosophy or ideology. Thus, Waller differed greatly from a John Dewey whose proposals for change were tied to a comprehensive philosophical perspective and from the Marxists whose position was based on a full-fledged critique of society.

It is difficult even to place Waller on the political spectrum. In an article in a Penn State magazine, he made fun of proselyting radical professors and their "only occasionally intelligent" student followers (1933:10), and in a later article he wrote that "a simpleton would suggest that the remedy for poverty in the midst of plenty is to redistribute income. We reject this solution at once because it would interfere with the institution of private property, would destroy the incentive for thrift and hard work and disjoint the entire economic system" (1936:926). In a letter to a colleague, Waller assessed the American political scene in 1942 and stated that "I predict a great rightist swing and even welcome part of it" (Goode, Furstenberg & Mitchell, 1970:97). Yet he also wrote of the "inequity and injustice in capitalist society" (1932:22) and described the

members of boards of directors of private social agencies and those who are large contributors of funds as including persons "who own slum tenements, profit from sweated labor, speculate in real estate in various not too ethical ways, and make lucrative deals with the government, to block effectively or. . . hinder any attempt to change the conditions of the masses" (1936:930).

While Waller had no well developed social or political philosophy, he did align himself with a democratic theory that had as its ideal an open class system with high vertical mobility based on competition. He also made recommendations concerning the improvement of the schools and he examined the place of the school in social change, considered next.

The Good School and Social Change

Waller is clear on the point that his analysis of the school was, even in the context of "evil things which should be remedied. . . expository rather than reformatory" (1932:Preface). His objective was to present things concretely and realistically, as they are, and above all, to be unbiased.

Waller came to his criticism of current practices and recommendations for reform as a sociologist and social scientist, although he was not one who needed to identify himself frequently as such. He was sometimes as impatient with reformers as with the evils they hoped to reform. Thus, he asserted that, "Making use of one verbal trick or another, sociologists have found excuses for importing into our science almost the whole of the humanitarian ideology with all its self-contradictions and illogicalities. Such practices give color to the belief that sociologists are 'fake professors of a pretended science'" (1936:932). He added that scientists

must adhere to the scientific morality and "completely subordinate all other values to that of intellectual and scientific integrity" (1932:933).

Yet, Waller understood that social science could not provide the answers to the world's problems, partly because science is half art (1934), but also because, "Science is instrumental, and the scientist does not and cannot decide for the good or for the evil side. He merely keeps the score" (1938:460). In sum, Waller was committed to the norms of science, but was fully aware of the limitations of science.

In examining Waller's recommendations for school reform, I will argue that his conceptions of the good school and the good teacher flowed quite directly from his descriptive analysis. In other words, Waller's scientific findings helped to shape his vision. Here, it is crucial to recall what science was for Waller, essentially the direct observation of cases in real life settings, done in as unbiased a manner as possible, and leading to interpretation and insight.

Those who adhere to a narrower view of science might not recognize the connection between description and vision in Waller. The style of his science and perhaps his colorful writing and penchant for the dramatic case could lead them to see him as merely a social commentator rather than as a student of school life and social change.

Waller explicitly addressed school improvement in the chapter titled "Recommendations" in The Sociology of Teaching and in a section titled "The 'Good' Teacher" in his chapter in the Roucek collection, a source which, incidentally, is not listed in Goode, Furstenberg and Mitchell's (1970) seemingly comprehensive Waller bibliography. Education as a vehicle for social change was explored in Waller's National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook chapter and in Roucek. However, both topics, the

improvement of the school, and the school as a agency for improving society, received some attention in Waller's other writings on education.

Waller's good school is one aiming toward the development of wholesome personality in children. This means the development of new levels of insight, new perceptual configurations, and new behavior patterns, all arranged in increasing complexity based on the age and cultural level of the student. The desirability of this enlargement of personality is the value judgment that mediates the connection of science and vision in Waller. Notice that the enlarged personality that Waller affirms is the reverse of the constricted personality that he saw resulting from the way that the schools typically operated.

Waller opposed the mechanistic effort to inculcate habits, a teaching method that imposed learning on the individual. He favored a more holistic approach that recognized the student as a person. Waller argued that the school should use the method of activities which reproduced real life situations in the schools, although he admitted the need to teach basic facts and skills, which he thought might be done separately. These recommendations are related to Waller's depiction of the school as offending the spontaneous nature of students and as providing an essentially artificial curriculum.

Waller called for a conception of student discipline that would do away with regimentation. Freedom and self-learning, he thought, could be sustained by the pressure of the social situation, pressure that would be consistent with a new kind of school and would be quite different from "the pressure of teacherish domination" (1932:452) that Waller found so prevalent in his case studies.

The good school also required teachers more virile and independent than those he studied. Such teachers would mean that students would come into contact with strong and inspiring minds. These teachers, of course, represent a sharp contrast with those who exhibit the inflexible and fussy personality that Waller believed developed in the teaching role. In order to get better teachers Waller recommended better pay. More important though was the removal of all organizational restrictions not directly pertinent to teaching, since Waller thought that many excellent persons were put off by them.

Waller also argued that students could be brought into contact with strong personalities by employing married women and those who wanted to use teaching as a stepping stone to other careers and by making use of stimulating community members. These recommendations also appear to stem from the diminishment of personality that Waller found in the schools.

In an obvious response to what he saw as the moralistic treatment of teachers by the community and the low and stereotypic status accorded them in the community, Waller demanded that teachers be free outside the school (1932:455). He contended that they should be treated like everyone else and that they should insist upon being so treated, neither gaining nor losing status as a result of their occupation.

Tied in with Waller's analysis of the school's affect on personality was his recommendation that psychological services be provided for both students and teachers, a point mentioned in passing earlier. These "bureaus of adjustment" (1932:456) would be oriented mainly towards the solution of the normal problems of development. This orientation would help generate among teachers an emphasis on control by understanding. The bureau would also assist teachers with their adjustment problems since

"only the normal, happy, and well-poised teacher is capable of discipline that is painless and constructive" (1932:458).

In a paragraph, Waller also made some recommendations on teacher training. One was that teachers should be trained to further the development of the personalities of the children they teach. Another was that teacher training should furnish insights into the social realities of the school, in effect, into the very things that Waller described in his sociological investigation into that organization.

I have already described Waller's conception of the "good" teacher in a previous section of this paper. That teacher is one who can meet internal demands for control, yet establish good personal relations with students and awaken interests and encourage growth (Waller, 1942). The point to be made is that the good teacher is one who can handle the expectations for domination that Waller found to be so central to the social system of the school, while avoiding the most debilitating effects of domination on the students and the teacher. Moreover, Waller's consideration of some of the details of the classroom style of the good teacher dovetailed in a telling way with events in the cases he used for illustration in his study of the school. For instance, while the good teacher knew when to ignore a certain kind of student transgression, the hapless case study teacher created a confrontation in which both students and teacher could only lose. Again, the connection is seen between Waller's vision of the good teacher and the results of his research on the school.

Waller recognized that it is easy to say how things should be but hard actually to attain social change. He did not deal substantively with the political processes of implementation. He did suggest that "programs for

the rehabilitation of the schools founder upon the rock of teacher resistance. For the most part, we consider this resistance well placed. The common-sense understanding which teachers have of their problems bites deeper into reality than do the maunderings of most theorists" (1932:457); and he recommended that reform should start with the insights of teachers. However, Waller's main contribution to educational change remains his analysis of schools as small societies, an analysis which grounds his vision of what schools might become, and it might be added, an analysis full of understandings that seem fundamental to, but lacking in, the current outpouring of reports from various and sundry commissions and other groups that aim to reform the schools.

Another aspect of Waller on reform concerns the place of the school in societal change. Here, too, his vision followed his empirical analysis. Waller saw that the school was the creature of the society and reflected its standards, not the other way around. His analysis told him that "the educator must work within rigidly established limits as an advocate of social change" (1938:459). Waller asked the question, "What can or should the teacher do in furthering social change?" He answered that teachers cannot man the barricades nor make revolutions, but they can inculcate a progressive spirit and receptivity to change in their students. They can conserve the best elements of tradition and encourage the best of the new. "Above all, they can encourage tolerance and belief in democratic processes of social change. Teachers. . . cannot effect any miracles of social reconstruction. . . . But perhaps they will do as much as can reasonably be expected of ordinary human beings who live in troubled times" (1942:222). Waller's view of societal reform was that of the realist and skeptic. Writing of school administrators, he stated that they are "caught by the

inevitable paradox of social reform: The good man cannot reform society and the bad man will not" (1938:460).

In a major paper on social change, Waller (1936) argued that there are organizational mores based on societal traditions and humanitarian mores oriented to remaking the world and that the two conflict and inhibit social change. Making changes that are basic requires that societal traditions be given up, something that even the advocates of change are often reluctant to do. This analysis, one that was intended to be descriptive and sociological, can be connected to Waller's general skepticism concerning the likelihood of meaningful social change and to his view, really a prediction, that the school cannot be an agency for basic societal reform.

In summary, I have presented and documented the position that Waller's visions for the reform of the school as well as his position on the school and social change were connected to his scientific analysis of the school and society. I called him a skeptic rather than a pessimist concerning change because at many points in his writings he seemed hopeful for the future. For instance, he asserted that he based his work on "a fundamental philosophy of meliorism, and upon the belief that whatever contributes to the understanding of human life must one day contribute to its reconstruction" (1932:4). Because of the close relation of his sociology and his vision, his views on the reform of education and society do not appear to derive from any of the organized ideologies of his day, although social scientists are inevitably influenced one way or another by their times and their culture. Waller thought of himself as a realist and a practical man and he thought of ideologues and utopians as unrealistic and impractical. Waller's descriptive and concrete science placed him close to

what is and his conception of what ought to be was based upon the idea that change must begin with an understanding of what is.

One might contend that Waller's vision was reduced by his science, or that the nature of his science allowed his personal experiences and viewpoints to influence his observations, but it would be mistaken to maintain that his science and his visions of school and social improvement were disconnected or inconsistent with one another. There is a basic consistency in Waller as social scientist and social critic.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Whatever his shortcomings, recent trends in the social sciences have made Waller seem more relevant. His methodology is enjoying renewed popularity as direct observation and case study research, improved since Waller's time, along with an emphasis on interpretation and insight, have become an increasingly important and increasingly accepted part of scholarship. His efforts to connect his science to change by making recommendations that could serve policy formulation is something that scholars are attempting more often today. Their efforts could eventually make Waller look very good by comparison. Finally, Waller's analysis of the school remains surprisingly pertinent in many of its essentials despite certain features that now seem dated. A reading of Waller can still furnish insights on school organizations and, with a little imagination, fresh hypotheses.

References

Abbott, M. G. & Stuart, C. M. (1969) The school over time: Our findings compared with those of Waller. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.

Becker, H. S. (1953) The teacher in the authority system of the public school. Journal of Educational Sociology, 27:128-41.

Bidwell, C. E. (1965) The school as a formal organization. In J. G. March (Ed.) Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Carlson, R. O. (1964) Environmental constraints and organizational consequences: The public school and its clients. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.) Behavioral science and educational administration. 63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Charters, W. W., Jr. (1963) The social background of teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Coleman, J. S. (1961) The adolescent society. New York: Free Press.

Cooley, C. H. (1902) Human nature and the social order. New York: Scribner.

Cusick, P. A. (1973) Inside high school. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cusick, P. A. (1983) The egalitarian ideal and the American high school. New York: Longman.

Davis, K. (1945) Obituary: Willard Walter Waller. American Sociological Review, 10:697-98.

Deal, T. E. & Kennedy, A. A. (1982) Corporate cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Farber, B. (1967) Introduction. In W. Waller. The old love and the new: Divorce and readjustment. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Floden, R. E. (1986) The cultures of teaching. In W. C. Wittrock (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Goode, W. J., Furstenberg, F. & Mitchell, L. R. (1970) Willard Waller on the family, education, and war. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gordon, C. W. (1957) The social system of the high school. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Gouldner, A. W. (1954) Patterns of industrial bureaucracy. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1967) Social relations in a secondary school. London: Routeledge and Kegan Paul.

Hill, R. L. (1968) Willard W. Waller. In D. L. Sills (Ed.) International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 16. New York: Macmillan and Free Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975) School teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, R. K. (1968) Social theory and social structure. New York: Free Press.

Metz, M. H. (1978) Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977) Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83:340-63.

Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1978) The structure of educational organizations. In M. W. Meyer (Ed.) Environments and Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, J. W. & Scott, W. R. (1983) Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ouchi, W. (1981) Theory z. New York: Avon.

Peshkin, A. (1978) Growing up American. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H. (1982) In search of excellence. New York: Harper and Row.

Simon, H. A. (1958) Administrative behavior. New York: Macmillan.

Stetter, M. W. & Willower, D. J. (1985) School principals as threshold guardians: An exploratory study. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 31:2-10.

Stinchcombe, A. L. (1964) Rebellion in a high school. Chicago: Quadrangle.

Tarr, J. S. (1977) Students in groups. Administrator's Notebook, 25:1-4.

Thompson, J. D. (1967) Organizations in action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tyler, W. B. (1985) The organizational structure of the school. Annual Review of Sociology, 11:49-73.

Waller, W. (1932) The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley.

Waller, W. (1933) The professor looks at students. The Old Main Bell. May: 9-10, 34.

Waller, W. (1934) Insight and scientific method. American Journal of Sociology, 40:285-97.

Waller, W. (1936) Social problems and the mores. American Sociological Review, 1:922-33.

Waller, W. (1938) Contributions to education of scientific knowledge about the organization of society and social pathology. In G. M. Whipple (Ed.) The scientific movement in education. 37th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

Waller, W. (1942) The teacher's roles. In J. S. Roucek & Associates (Eds.) Sociological foundations of education. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Waller, W. (1943) Revolt in the classroom. The Saturday Review, 26, Sept. 18:4-6.

Willis, P. (1977) Learning to labor. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Willower, D. J. (1967) The handbook of organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, 2:89-99.

Willower, D. J. (1971a) Social control in schools. In L. C. Deighton (Ed.) Encyclopedia of education, Vol. 8. New York: Macmillan and Free Press.

Willower, D. J. (1971b) The teacher subculture. In L. W. Drabick (Ed.) Interpreting education: a sociological approach. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Willower, D. J. (1986a) Mystifications and mysteries in thought and research in educational administration. In G. S. Johnston & C. C. Yeakey (Eds.) Research and thought in administrative theory. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Willower, D. J. (1986b) Organization theory and the management of schools. In E. Hoyle & A. McMahon (Eds.) World yearbook of education, 1986: The management of schools. London: Kogan-Page.

Willower, D. J. & Jones, R. G. (1967) Control in an educational organization. In J. D. Raths, et al. (Eds.) Studying teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Willower, D. J. & Smith, J. P. (1986-87) Organizational culture in schools: Myth and creation. High School Journal, 70:87-94.